

REMARKS


In the outstanding final official action, claims 1, 3, 4 and 6 were allowed while claim 5 was rejected under 35 USC 102 (e) as being anticipated by Sowlati, for the reasons of record. With reference to allowable claims 1 and 3-4, it was noted that the prior art fails to teach the limitation of a bias circuit with a high-frequency current blocking circuit including an inductance. However, claim 5, as previously presented, did not include such limitations, and accordingly applicant's prior arguments, although deemed persuasive with respect to the other claims containing the limitation of an inductance, were not deemed persuasive with respect to claim 5 because that claim does not recite the provision of a inductance.

In response, and in order to place claim 5 in condition for allowance, this claim has been amended in order to more particularly and precisely recite biasing the control electrodes of the cascade transistors with a bias circuit and providing the bias circuit with a high frequency current blocking circuit including an inductance. It is respectfully submitted that these additional method limitations, corresponding to the analogous allowable subject matter added to claim 1 in the last amendment, place claim 5 in condition for allowance.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the currently-pending claims, including claim 5 as herewith amended, are clearly patentably

distinguishable over the cited and applied art. Accordingly, entry of this amendment, reconsideration of the rejection of claim 5 and allowance of this application are earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By   
Steven R. Biren, Reg. No. 26,531  
(914) 333-9631  
July 10, 2006